



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/677,403

09/30/2000

CARL A. EDLUND

1018.125US1

6921

45809

7590

11/14/2006

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/677,403

Applicant(s)

EDLUND ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and the amendment filed 12 September 2006.
2. Claims 1-16 and 28-29 are pending. Claims 1, 7, and 28 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gessner et al. (US 6343377, filed 30 December 1997, hereafter Gessner).

As per independent claim 1, Gessner discloses a system comprising:

- A markup language core engine for providing categories of behaviors including layout and rendering behaviors (Figures 1-2; column 3, lines 1-4: Here, core functionality is disclosed for a browser. This core functionality is extended via APIs to delegate processes, including layout and rendering behaviors)
- At least one external component designed to provide categories of external component behaviors including at least one of an external component layout

behavior and an external component rendering behavior in addition to the behaviors provided by the core engine (Figure 2)

- A pair of interfaces associated with each external component for communication between the external component and the core engine (Figure 2: Here, APIs are interfaces for communication between the core engine and external components)
- A mechanism included in the core engine to extend a selected category of behavior of the core engine with the behaviors of a same category of the at least one external component, such that the behaviors of the same category of the at least one external component participate with the behaviors of the core engine, wherein the mechanism and the at least one external component communicate through the pair of interfaces to confirm participation, and participation includes at least one external component delegating a portion of a processing of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine (Figure 4; column 3, line 21-column 4, line 13)

As per independent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claims 28 is similarly rejected under Gessner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3, 7-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gessner and further in view of Weis et al. (US 6161126, filed 2 February 2002, hereafter Wies).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Gessner discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner fails to specifically disclose a first interface of each pair is exposed by the external component for querying by the mechanism and a second interface of each pair is exposed by the mechanism for querying by the external component. However, Wies discloses wherein a first interface of each pair is exposed by the external component for querying by the mechanism (Wies Abstract Line 4 Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine and Col 22 Lines 55-57), and a second interface of each pair is exposed by the mechanism for querying by the external component (Wies Abstract Line 4 Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine and Col 22 Lines 55-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to allow a user to interact with the system via a mouse (Wies: column 23, lines 32-57).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Gessner discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component override comparable behaviors of the core engine. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-

63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine) override comparable behaviors of the core engine (Wies Col 18 Lines 60 i.e. override Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Col 23 Line 2 browser engine).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

As per independent claim 7, Gessner discloses a method performed by a mechanism for extending a behavior of a core engine with a behavior of an external component, both the core engine behavior and the external component behavior belonging to a same category of behavior, the category being at least one of a layout behavior and a rendering behavior, the method comprising:

- Calling a behavior initialization method of the external component to determine how the behavior of the external component participates with the behavior of the core engine, wherein the core engine behavior and the external component behavior belong to the same category of behavior and participation includes the at least one external component delegating some processing of the core engine behavior and the external component behavior, belonging to the same category of behavior, to the core engine in one mode (column 3, line 21- column 4, line 13; Figure 2)

- Calling a behavior method of the external component for the external component to provide the behavior of the external component when the core engine is providing the behavior of the core, so that the behavior of the external component participates with the behavior of the core engine (column 3, line 21- column 4, line 13; Figure 2)
- Receiving a call to corresponding behavior method of the mechanism for the external component to communicate with the core engine during participation of the behavior of the external component with the behavior of the core engine (column 3, line 21- column 4, line 13; Figure 2)

Gessner fails to specifically disclose participation includes replacing core engine behavior with external component behavior in another mode. However, Wies discloses replacing core engine behavior with external component behavior in a second mode (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine; Wies Col 18 Lines 60 i.e. override Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Col 23 Line 2 browser engine).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

As per dependent claim 8, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 8 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 9, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 9 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 10, Gessner and Wies disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner further discloses the method wherein the behavior is fully delegated to the external component from the core engine, which is specified by the external component in response to calling the behavior initialization method of the external component (column 3, line 21-column 4, line 13; Figure 2).

As per dependent claim 12, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1. Claim 12 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 13 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 15, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 16, Gessner and Wies disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 7, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner further discloses a computer program from a computer readable medium (column 4, lines 52-57).

As per dependent claim 29, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 29 is similarly rejected.

7. Claims 4-6, 11, and 14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gessner and Wies and in further view of Ramaley et al. (US 6585777, filed 19 June 1999, herein after Ramaley).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Gessner discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component of the core engine. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component of the core engine (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine and Col 6 Lines 1-5 i.e. similar Col 23 Line 2 browser engine). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Gessner and Wies do not specifically mention comparable behaviors. However, Ramaley mentions comparing files (Ramaley Col 12 Lines 31-36). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Gessner and Wies, providing the benefit of a comparison operation to determine whether support files identified by the prior file list are no longer identified by the current file list as taught by Ramaley Col 13 Lines 30-36.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Gessner discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component.

However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Gessner and Wies do not specifically mention behaviors that are attached and can be applied and then removed. However, Ramaley mentions attached behaviors that can be applied and removed (Ramaley Col 9 Lines 28 i.e. connected Col 5 Lines 50-53 i.e. embedded and Col 5 Lines 54 i.e. removed). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Wies, providing the benefit of a file embedded within a primary file that is detected and a location removed for the file to represent the embedded file as taught by Ramaley Col 5 Line 50-55.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Gessner discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gessner fails to specifically disclose the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component are element behaviors. However, Wies discloses wherein the behaviors provided by one of the at least one external component are element behaviors (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's

system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Gessner and Wies do not specifically mention behaviors that are applied. However, Ramaley mentions behaviors that are applied (Ramaley Col 9 Lines 28 i.e. connected). It was have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Wies, providing the benefit of connecting to having an exemplary operating environment.

In regard to dependent claim 11, Gessner and Wies disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Wies further discloses wherein the behavior implemented by the external component is called after the ... of the core engine is performed (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine Col 23 Line 2 browser engine) which is specified by the external component in response to calling the behavior ... of the external component (Wies Col 3 Lines 35-63 i.e. HTML, Layout and Col 19 Lines 50-64 HTML, rendering and Wies Col 23 Line 35-38 i.e. external client machine Col 23 Line 2 browser engine)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gessner's system with Wies's system, since it would have allowed a user to specify system preferences (Wies: column 16, lines 59-63).

Gessner and Wies do not specifically mention comparable behaviors. However, Ramaley mentions comparing files (Ramaley Col 12 Lines 31-36). It was have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ramaley to Gessner and Wies, providing the benefit of a comparison operation to determine whether support files identified by the prior file list are no longer identified by the current file list as taught by Ramaley Col 13 Lines 30-36.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 14 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Gessner fails to disclose wherein, "participation *includes the at least one external component delegating a portion of a processing of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine* (page 8)." The examiner respectfully disagrees. While Gessner fails to teach delegation a **portion less than the entirety** of a processing of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine, Gessner teaches delegation of a portion of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine (Figure 4; column 3, line 21- column 4, line 13). In this instance, Gessner transfers all of the processing of the behaviors to the core engine. However, because portion may be defined as something determined in relation to something that includes it, all is the largest portion possible. Therefore, delegation of all of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine is equivalent to delegation of a portion of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine.

The applicant's remaining arguments appear to be based upon the argument above. This arguments are similarly not persuasive.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER